

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Northern District of Ohio

United States of America)	
v.)	
Gregory Prince)	Case No. 1:23-CR-104
Defendant)	

ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL

Part I - Eligibility for Detention

Upon the

Motion of the Government attorney pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1), or
 Motion of the Government or Court's own motion pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(2),

the Court held a detention hearing and found that detention is warranted. This order sets forth the Court's findings of fact and conclusions of law, as required by 18 U.S.C. § 3142(i), in addition to any other findings made at the hearing.

Part II - Findings of Fact and Law as to Presumptions under § 3142(e)

A. Rebuttable Presumption Arises Under 18 U.S.C. § 3142(e)(2) (previous violator): There is a rebuttable presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the safety of any other person and the community because the following conditions have been met:

(1) the defendant is charged with one of the following crimes described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1):

(a) a crime of violence, a violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1591, or an offense listed in 18 U.S.C. § 2332b(g)(5)(B) for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed; **or**

(b) an offense for which the maximum sentence is life imprisonment or death; **or**

(c) an offense for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed in the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. §§ 801-904), the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. §§ 951-971), or Chapter 705 of Title 46, U.S.C. (46 U.S.C. §§ 70501-70508); **or**

(d) any felony if such person has been convicted of two or more offenses described in subparagraphs (a) through (c) of this paragraph, or two or more State or local offenses that would have been offenses described in subparagraphs (a) through (c) of this paragraph if a circumstance giving rise to Federal jurisdiction had existed, or a combination of such offenses; **or**

(e) any felony that is not otherwise a crime of violence but involves:

(i) a minor victim; (ii) the possession of a firearm or destructive device (as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 921); (iii) any other dangerous weapon; or (iv) a failure to register under 18 U.S.C. § 2250; **and**

(2) the defendant has previously been convicted of a Federal offense that is described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1), or of a State or local offense that would have been such an offense if a circumstance giving rise to Federal jurisdiction had existed; **and**

(3) the offense described in paragraph (2) above for which the defendant has been convicted was committed while the defendant was on release pending trial for a Federal, State, or local offense; **and**

(4) a period of not more than five years has elapsed since the date of conviction, or the release of the defendant from imprisonment, for the offense described in paragraph (2) above, whichever is later.

B. Rebuttable Presumption Arises Under 18 U.S.C. § 3142(e)(3) (narcotics, firearm, other offenses): There is a rebuttable presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the appearance of the defendant as required and the safety of the community because there is probable cause to believe that the defendant committed one or more of the following offenses:

- (1) an offense for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed in the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. §§ 801-904), the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. §§ 951-971), or Chapter 705 of Title 46, U.S.C. (46 U.S.C. §§ 70501-70508);
- (2) an offense under 18 U.S.C. §§ 924(c), 956(a), or 2332b;
- (3) an offense listed in 18 U.S.C. § 2332b(g)(5)(B) for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed;
- (4) an offense under Chapter 77 of Title 18, U.S.C. (18 U.S.C. §§ 1581-1597) for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 20 years or more is prescribed; **or**
- (5) an offense involving a minor victim under 18 U.S.C. §§ 1201, 1591, 2241, 2242, 2244(a)(1), 2245, 2251, 2251A, 2252(a)(1), 2252(a)(2), 2252(a)(3), 2252A(a)(1), 2252A(a)(2), 2252A(a)(3), 2252A(a)(4), 2260, 2421, 2422, 2423, or 2425.

C. Conclusions Regarding Applicability of Any Presumption Established Above

- The defendant has not introduced sufficient evidence to rebut the presumption above, and detention is ordered on that basis. *(Part III need not be completed.)*

OR

- The defendant has presented evidence sufficient to rebut the presumption, but after considering the presumption and the other factors discussed below, detention is warranted.

Part III - Analysis and Statement of the Reasons for Detention

After considering the factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(g) and the information presented at the detention hearing, the Court concludes that the defendant must be detained pending trial because the Government has proven:

- By clear and convincing evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the safety of any other person and the community.
- By a preponderance of evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the defendant's appearance as required.

In addition to any findings made on the record at the hearing, the reasons for detention include the following:

- Weight of evidence against the defendant is strong
- Subject to lengthy period of incarceration if convicted
- Prior criminal history
- Participation in criminal activity while on probation, parole, or supervision
- History of violence or use of weapons
- History of alcohol or substance abuse
- Lack of stable employment
- Lack of stable residence
- Lack of financially responsible sureties

- Lack of significant community or family ties to this district
- Significant family or other ties outside the United States
- Lack of legal status in the United States
- Subject to removal or deportation after serving any period of incarceration
- Prior failure to appear in court as ordered
- Prior attempt(s) to evade law enforcement
- Use of alias(es) or false documents
- Background information unknown or unverified
- Prior violations of probation, parole, or supervised release

OTHER REASONS OR FURTHER EXPLANATION:

The United States did not satisfy its burden of showing by a preponderance of the evidence that Mr. Prince is a flight risk. The United States has, however, met its burden of demonstrating by clear and convincing evidence that Mr. Prince would be a danger to the community if released, and that no condition or combination of conditions would ensure the community's safety.

1) 18 U.S.C. 3142(g)(1): As to the nature of the offense, the government proffered that Mr. Prince - who was on parole for attempted murder and felonious assault - entered a liquor store carrying a concealed firearm. When stopped by officers after exiting the store, the government proffered through the arrest report that Mr. Prince initially disobeyed orders to keep his hands up and reached for a handgun loaded with 22 live rounds of ammunition, though he later complied with officers' instructions. This factor therefore weighs in favor of detention based on danger to the community.

2) 18 U.S.C. 3142(g)(2): This factor "goes to the weight of the evidence of dangerousness, not the weight of the defendant's guilt." *United States v. Stone*, 608 F.3d 939, 948 (6th Cir. 2010). The Pretrial Services Report ("Report") outlines Mr. Prince's criminal history since age 21, when he was charged with carrying concealed weapons and improperly handling firearms in a motor vehicle. At age 22, Mr. Prince was sentenced to 8 years in custody for attempted murder (shooting the victim in the head) and felonious assault. Mr. Prince was released in 10/2021 and thereafter violated his parole by allegedly committing the instant offense in 6/2022, when he was sentenced to an additional 9 months in custody. Bearing in mind Mr. Prince's violent criminal history, the involvement of firearms in these prior crimes, and the fact that the instant alleged offense occurred while Mr. Harris was on supervised release, this factor weighs in favor of detention based on danger to the community.

3) 18 U.S.C. 3142(g)(3): The Court recognizes that Mr. Prince has pursued educational opportunities during and after his incarceration, mostly recently taking business classes at Cuyahoga Community College. He also has strong family and community ties. These factors, however, are more compelling arguments as to risk of flight rather than danger to the community, especially because the instant firearm offense occurred while on supervised release. This factor is therefore at best neutral as to danger to the community and, in any event, is strongly outweighed by the other 3142(g) factors discussed herein.

4) 18 U.S.C. 3142(g)(4): For the reasons set forth above in (g)(1) and (g)(2), the Court has substantial concerns regarding the safety of the community if Mr. Prince were to be released.

The Court further finds that the United States' arguments on the record that there are no conditions or combination of conditions (such as electronic monitoring or designating Mr. Prince's mother as a third party custodian) that would ensure the community's safety if Mr. Prince was released to be well-taken. This is underscored by the fact that the instant offense occurred while on supervised release. See *United States v. Hanson*, 2022 WL 1813585, at *6 (N.D. Ohio May 3, 2022) ("As the Second Circuit has recognized, home detention and electronic monitoring at best replicate a detention facility without the confidence of security such a facility instills.")

Part IV - Directions Regarding Detention

The defendant is remanded to the custody of the Attorney General or to the Attorney General's designated representative for confinement in a corrections facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or being held in custody pending appeal. The defendant must be afforded a reasonable opportunity for private consultation with defense counsel. On order of a court of the United States or on request of an attorney for the Government, the person in charge of the corrections facility must deliver the defendant to a United States Marshal for the purpose of an appearance in connection with a court proceeding.

Date: 03/21/2023

/s Jennifer Dowdell Armstrong

United States Magistrate Judge